



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/647,796

08/26/2003

Zeev Glozman

32965

2006

67801

7590

02/03/2010

MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.

P.O. BOX 16446

ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

DAY, HERNG DER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2128

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/647,796	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GLOZMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HERNG-DER DAY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-39 and 41-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-39 and 41-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

**1.** This communication is in response to Applicants' Response ("Response") and RCE to Office Action dated July 8, 2009, filed January 7, 2010.

**1-1.** Claims 1 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-16, 18-39, and 41-49 are pending.

**1-2.** Claims 1-16, 18-39, and 41-49 have been examined and rejected.

### ***Claim Objections***

**2.** The "a" before "an absolute length" in line 6 of the amended claim 1 should be removed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

**3.** The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**4.** Claims 1-16, 18-22, 46, 47, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**4-1.** Claim 1 recites the limitation, "d. using *the obtained medical image* in said imaging apparatus, said image comprising said calibrated imaged anatomical structure, planning a result of the orthopedic surgical procedure to be performed on the anatomical structure to reduce said trauma present in said bone, by rearranging of *said image anatomical structure segments* from said original arrangement to simulate said result within said anatomical structure" in lines 21-26 of the claim. However, as recited in lines 10-11 of the claim, "b. obtaining and displaying in said

Art Unit: 2128

imaging apparatus *the obtained medical images* of the anatomical structure along with said calibration”, it does not appear that any *anatomical structure segment* is included and may be rearranged in *the obtained medical images* recited in steps b and d. Clarification of the metes and bounds, via clearer claim language, is requested.

**4-2.** Claims not specifically rejected above are rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**5.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**6.** Claims 1-16, 18-39, and 41-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krause et al., U.S. Patent 6,711,432 B1 issued March 23, 2004 and filed October 23, 2000, in view of Kenet et al., U.S. Patent 5,016,173 issued May 14, 1991.

**6-1.** Regarding claim 1, Krause et al. disclose a method of image manipulation in an imaging apparatus for preoperative planning and simulating of an orthopedic surgical procedure to be performed on an anatomical structure, using medical images of the anatomical structure, comprising inter alia:

[[a. providing a real dimension unit in said imaging apparatus, said real dimension unit defining an absolute length, thereby to provide said absolute length to appear in an image

Art Unit: 2128

alongside said anatomical structure to provide an image defining a calibration of the imaged anatomical structure alongside said anatomical structure;]]

b. obtaining and displaying in said imaging apparatus the obtained medical images of the anatomical structure [[along with said calibration from said real dimension unit,]] prior to said orthopedic surgical procedure[[, and using said real dimension unit calibration determining an extent of trauma present in said anatomical structure]] (X-ray or fluoroscopic images of a patient's bone, column 6, lines 18-20; several regular X-ray images of the patient (which are typically taken before any surgery), column 6, lines 42-51);

c. segmenting the anatomical structure into segments in said medical image in said imaging apparatus prior to said orthopedic surgical procedure, said segments being in an original arrangement (Segmentation, column 6, lines 52-57; segmented at regular intervals 120 throughout the 3D model, column 9, lines 14-22; FIG. 6A shows that the same 20 virtual slices 142 are taken as in the single osteotomy procedure, column 9, lines 53-54), the anatomical structure comprising bones and the segmentation comprising segmentation of the bone to form independently movable bone part segments to represent trauma present in said bones (The present invention may be used in cases of multiple trauma with long bone fractures. ... apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40); and

d. using the obtained medical image in said imaging apparatus, said image comprising said [[calibrated]] imaged anatomical structure, planning a result of the orthopedic surgical procedure to be performed on the anatomical structure to reduce said trauma present in said bone (Figures 4-6; apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40), by rearranging of said image anatomical structure segments from said original arrangement to simulate said result within said anatomical structure (the planning

Art Unit: 2128

software preferably goes through all possible iterations of osteotomy locations. With a single osteotomy and 20 slices 142, there are 20 iterations. With a double osteotomy and 20 slices, there are just under 200 unique iterations, column 9, line 14, through column 10, line 7) so that [[calibrated]] output images comprising said bone segments rearranged to reduce said trauma are produced (the planning software preferably plots the results on a 3D diagram, column 10, lines 8-17).

Krause et al. fail to expressly disclose: (1) a. providing a real dimension unit in said imaging apparatus, said real dimension unit defining an absolute length, thereby to provide said absolute length to appear in an image alongside said anatomical structure to provide an image defining a calibration of the imaged anatomical structure alongside said anatomical structure; and (2) and using said real dimension unit calibration determining an extent of trauma present in said anatomical structure.

Kenet et al. disclose, "Once an image has been captured, calibration 314 of the image is performed to calibrate for *absolute distances* and to correct for spatial, color, or intensity distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances. ... For example, an image of a ruler or grid may be obtained during a calibration session, or simultaneously with the image of the surface structure of interest." (Kenet, column 10, lines 40-51). In other word, associated with an image of a ruler in it, the image of interest becomes a *calibrated image* and is calibrated for *absolute distances*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Krause et al. to incorporate the teachings of Kenet et al. because as suggested by Kenet et al., an image of a ruler obtained simultaneously with the image

Art Unit: 2128

of the surface structure of interest would calibrate for absolute distances and to correct for spatial distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances.

**6-2.** Regarding claim 2, Krause et al. further disclose comprising dynamic rendering of medical device from pre defined members, the method allowing dynamic rendering of medical devices with a pre defined relationship, wherein two or more members can be integrated to one member in runtime according to a predefined rule (multifunctional markers 110, column 10, lines 25-28).

**6-3.** Regarding claim 3, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said medical images are X-ray images (regular X-ray images, column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-4.** Regarding claim 4, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said medical images are a combination of plurality of imaging techniques (fusing selective volumetric MRI/CAT scan data, column 8, lines 4-14).

**6-5.** Regarding claim 5, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said medical images comprise a plurality of views of said anatomical structure (a series of two-dimension representations of the patient's bone, column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-6.** Regarding claim 6, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the obtaining step comprises transforming of said medical images to digital images (until the projections of the 3D bone model 84, 86 match the X-ray or other images 83 of the patient's bone, column 7, lines 21-44).

**6-7.** Regarding claim 7, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said obtaining includes composing of several images of the same anatomical structure into a full-length view of said anatomical structure (use several regular X-ray images of the patient, column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-8.** Regarding claim 8, Kenet et al. further disclose wherein the obtaining step comprises calibrating of images (calibration 314 of the image is performed, column 10, lines 40-44).

Art Unit: 2128

**6-9.** Regarding claim 9, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said calibrating comprises registration of different views (to more closely match the two-dimensional segmented bone images, column 7, lines 9-17).

**6-10.** Regarding claim 10, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said calibrating comprises dimension and orientation calibration (the 3D template bone model 88 is reshaped to resemble the patient's actual bone 82, column 7, lines 9-17).

**6-11.** Regarding claim 11, Kenet et al. further disclose wherein said calibrating comprises image enhancements comprising brightness and contrast adjustments, and edge detection (to correct for spatial, color, or intensity distortions, column 10, lines 40-44).

**6-12.** Regarding claim 12, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the segmenting step is performed in at least one of a group of ways, comprising: manual performance by a medical expert, automatic performance, wherein the anatomical structure segments are segmented according to predefined rules, and semi-automatic performance, wherein the segmenting step is performed automatically with the assistance of a medical expert (Segmentation may be accomplished using a light board and digitizing stylus, column 6, lines 54-57).

**6-13.** Regarding claim 13, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said rearranging comprises simulating different positioning of said image anatomical structure segments (the planning software preferably goes through all possible iterations of osteotomy locations. With a single osteotomy and 20 slices 142, there are 20 iterations. With a double osteotomy and 20 slices, there are just under 200 unique iterations, column 9, lines 23-67).

**6-14.** Regarding claim 14, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said different positioning of said image anatomical structure segments relates to reducing of said trauma during trauma



Art Unit: 2128

treatment (apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40).

**6-15.** Regarding claim 15, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said different positioning of said image anatomical structure segments relates to pre designed osteotomy treatments (determine the appropriate locations for the double osteotomy or other multiple orthopedic procedures, column 10, lines 8-17).

**6-16.** Regarding claim 16, Krause et al. further disclose comprising inserting implants, in the manner that superposition of implants and said segmented anatomical structure over non-segmented fragments of said anatomical structure is provided (multifunctional markers 110, column 10, lines 25-28).

**6-17.** Regarding claim 18, Krause et al. further disclose comprising a step of choosing a plurality of fixation elements from a predefined database (the guides and markers 110 have already been modeled by the planning computer, column 10, lines 34-42).

**6-18.** Regarding claim 19, Krause et al. further disclose comprising rules for correct positioning of said fixation elements so incorrect positioning of said fixation elements is prevented (determine the appropriate locations, column 10, lines 8-17).

**6-19.** Regarding claim 20, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said planning comprises producing and storing the output images and planning reports of a plurality of alternatives of said steps of segmenting and planning, for the purpose that the best alternative for medical treatment is selected from said alternatives; said planning report comprising part definition of said calibrated artificial elements selected for the treatment as well as patient information (determine the appropriate locations, column 10, lines 8-17); said planning report comprising part definition

Art Unit: 2128

of calibrated artificial elements selected for the treatment as well as patient information (preliminary surgical plan, column 10, lines 46-62).

**6-20.** Regarding claim 21, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising a step of providing hard copies of said output images and said planning reports of a selected set of said alternatives (The surgical plan may be sent to the surgeon using various media types, column 11, lines 19-27).

**6-21.** Regarding claim 22, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising a step of communicating said output images and said planning reports to a plurality of remote users (to remotely access other experts, column 2, lines 48-58).

**6-22.** Regarding claim 23, Krause et al. disclose an apparatus for pre planning and simulating of an orthopedic surgical procedure to be performed on an anatomical structure, using medical images of the anatomical structure, the apparatus comprising;

[[a. a real dimension unit defining an absolute length, to provide said absolute length to appear in an image alongside said anatomical structure to provide an image defining a calibration of the imaged anatomical structure alongside said anatomical structure;]]

b. segmenting means for defining and marking anatomical structure segments in an original arrangement in the medical images of the anatomical structure (Segmentation, column 6, lines 52-57; segmented at regular intervals 120 throughout the 3D model, column 9, lines 14-22; FIG. 6A shows that the same 20 virtual slices 142 are taken as in the single osteotomy procedure, column 9, lines 53-54), the anatomical structure comprising bones and the segments being segments of said bones independently movable to be representative of trauma present in said bones (The present invention may be used in cases of multiple trauma with long bone fractures.

Art Unit: 2128

... apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40);

c. planning means for planning a result of said orthopedic surgical procedure to be performed on the anatomical structure to minimize said trauma, using the [[calibrated]] medical images of the anatomical structure [[and said real dimension unit calibration to estimate an extent of said trauma]] (Figures 4-6; apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40), the planning means comprising means for rearranging of said image anatomical structure segments from said original arrangement to simulate said result within said anatomical structure (the planning software preferably goes through all possible iterations of osteotomy locations. With a single osteotomy and 20 slices 142, there are 20 iterations. With a double osteotomy and 20 slices, there are just under 200 unique iterations, column 9, line 14, through column 10, line 7) thereby to produce [[calibrated]] output images comprising said rearranged bone segments (the planning software preferably plots the results on a 3D diagram, column 10, lines 8-17);

d. a memory for storing said medical images and a desired result (a planning computer ... has developed a detailed preliminary surgical plan, column 11, lines 15-19); and,

e. a display for displaying said [[calibrated]] medical images and said output images (The surgeon can preferably view the 3D computer simulation or other plan of the surgery, column 11, lines 19-27).

Krause et al. fail to expressly disclose: (1) a. a real dimension unit defining an absolute length, to provide said absolute length to appear in an image alongside said anatomical structure to provide an image defining a calibration of the imaged anatomical structure alongside said

Art Unit: 2128

anatomical structure; and (2) using ... said real dimension unit calibration to estimate an extent of said trauma.

Kenet et al. disclose, "Once an image has been captured, calibration 314 of the image is performed to calibrate for *absolute distances* and to correct for spatial, color, or intensity distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances. ... For example, an image of a ruler or grid may be obtained during a calibration session, or simultaneously with the image of the surface structure of interest." (Kenet, column 10, lines 40-51). In other word, associated with an image of a ruler in it, the image of interest becomes a *calibrated image* and is calibrated for *absolute distances*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Krause et al. to incorporate the teachings of Kenet et al. because as suggested by Kenet et al., an image of a ruler obtained simultaneously with the image of the surface structure of interest would calibrate for absolute distances and to correct for spatial distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances.

**6-23.** Regarding claim 24, Krause et al. further disclose comprising means for dynamic rendering of medical device from pre defined members, allowing dynamic rendering of medical devices with a pre defined relationship, wherein two or more members can be integrated to one member in runtime according to a predefined rule (multifunctional markers 110, column 10, lines 25-28).

**6-24.** Regarding claim 25, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the medical images are X-ray images (regular X-ray images, column 6, lines 42-51).

Art Unit: 2128

**6-25.** Regarding claim 26, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the medical images are combination of a plurality of imaging techniques (fusing selective volumetric MRI/CAT scan data, column 8, lines 4-14).

**6-26.** Regarding claim 27, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the medical images comprise a plurality of views of the same anatomical structures (a series of two-dimension representations of the patient's bone, column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-27.** Regarding claim 28, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising means for transforming said medical images to digital images (until the projections of the 3D bone model 84, 86 match the X-ray or other images 83 of the patient's bone, column 7, lines 21-44).

**6-28.** Regarding claim 29, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising means for composing of several images of the same anatomical structure into a full-length view of said anatomical structure (use several regular X-ray images of the patient, column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-29.** Regarding claim 30, Kenet et al. further disclose additionally comprising calibration means for images (calibration 314 of the image is performed, column 10, lines 40-44).

**6-30.** Regarding claim 31, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the calibration means are also utilized for registration of different views (to more closely match the two-dimensional segmented bone images, column 7, lines 9-17).

**6-31.** Regarding claim 32, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the calibration means are also utilized for dimension and orientation calibration (the 3D template bone model 88 is reshaped to resemble the patient's actual bone 82, column 7, lines 9-17).

**6-32.** Regarding claim 33, Kenet et al. further disclose wherein the calibration means are also utilized for image enhancements (to calibrate for absolute distances and to correct for spatial,

Art Unit: 2128

color, or intensity distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances, column 10, line 40-44).

**6-33.** Regarding claim 34, Kenet et al. further disclose wherein the calibration means are also utilized for correction of image distortions (to correct for spatial, color, or intensity distortions, column 10, lines 40-44).

**6-34.** Regarding claim 35, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the segmenting means are manually operated by a medical expert or wherein the segmenting means are automatically operated according to predefined rules, or wherein the segmenting means are operated semi-automatically in the manner that the segmenting step is performed automatically with the assistance of a medical expert (Segmentation may be accomplished using a light board and digitizing stylus, column 6, lines 54-57).

**6-35.** Regarding claim 36, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the planning means are additionally utilized for simulating different positioning of said anatomical structure segments (the planning software preferably goes through all possible iterations of osteotomy locations. With a single osteotomy and 20 slices 142, there are 20 iterations. With a double osteotomy and 20 slices, there are just under 200 unique iterations, column 9, lines 23-67).

**6-36.** Regarding claim 37, Krause et al. further disclose wherein the planning means are utilized for simulating reduction of fractures during trauma treatment (apply the present system to obtain an exact realignment of the fractured bone, column 17, lines 34-40).

**6-37.** Regarding claim 38, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said different positioning of said anatomical structure segments relates to pre designed osteotomy treatments for deformed anatomical structures (determine the appropriate locations for the double osteotomy or other multiple orthopedic procedures, column 10, lines 8-17).

Art Unit: 2128

**6-38.** Regarding claim 39, Krause et al. further disclose comprising implants, for superposition in the manner that superposition of implants and said segmented anatomical structure over non-segmented fragments of said anatomical structure is provided (multifunctional markers 110, column 10, lines 25-28).

**6-39.** Regarding claim 41, Krause et al. further disclose comprising a predefined database comprising predefined sets of fixation elements (the guides and markers 110 have already been modeled by the planning computer, column 10, lines 34-42).

**6-40.** Regarding claim 42, Krause et al. further disclose comprising means for correct positioning of said fixation elements so incorrect positioning of said fixation elements is prevented (determine the appropriate locations, column 10, lines 8-17).

**6-41.** Regarding claim 43, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising a means for producing and storing planning reports of plurality of alternatives, for the purpose that the best alternative for medical treatment is selected from said alternatives (determine the appropriate locations, column 10, lines 8-17), said planning reports comprising part definition of calibrated artificial elements selected for the medical treatment and patient information (preliminary surgical plan, column 10, lines 46-62).

**6-42.** Regarding claim 44, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising a hard copy producer configured to produce hard copies of said output images and said planning reports of a selected set of said alternatives (The surgical plan may be sent to the surgeon using various media types, column 11, lines 19-27).

**6-43.** Regarding claim 45, Krause et al. further disclose additionally comprising a communication device for communicating said output images and said planning reports to remote users (to remotely access other experts, column 2, lines 48-58).

Art Unit: 2128

**6-44.** Regarding claim 46, Kenet et al. further disclose wherein said real dimension unit comprises an object of a known length (an image of a ruler ... may be obtained ... simultaneously with the image of the surface structure of interest, column 10, lines 49-51).

**6-45.** Regarding claim 47, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said medical images of the anatomical structure are imaged on an imager remote from the location of the orthopedic surgical procedure (several regular X-ray images of the patient (which are typically taken before any surgery), column 6, lines 42-51).

**6-46.** Regarding claim 48, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said displayed image comprises a final image for the orthopedic surgical procedure (a planning computer ... has developed a detailed preliminary surgical plan, ... The surgical plan may be sent to the surgeon using various media types including: still images and illustrations, column 11, lines 15-25).

**6-47.** Regarding claim 49, Krause et al. further disclose wherein said obtained output images further comprise, at least one feature selected from the group consisting of: a plurality of calibrated organs; a plurality of calibrated artificial elements; and at least one superposition of said calibrated artificial elements on said calibrated organs or organ segments (Figure 4).

### ***Applicants' Arguments***

**7.** Applicants argue the following:

**7-1.** 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

(1) "Applicant in response replaces the term "bone" in claim 1 with the term "anatomical structure"." (Page 10, paragraph 2, Response)

**7-2.** 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections



Art Unit: 2128

(2) "Applicant, in response amends claim 1 by tying the body of the claim to an imaging apparatus." (Page 10, paragraph 3, Response)

**7-3. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

(3) "Applicant raises a new argument against the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by explaining that Krause compares his model with a generalized 3D model of the particular area of bone he is dealing with. Such a 3D model is not a real dimension unit since it does not provide a real dimension at all. The present application, by contrast uses a real dimension unit alongside the anatomic structure for calibrating the anatomical structure." (Page 11, paragraph 4, Response)

(4) "The present application, by contrast, may use an image of any object for the calibration. Page 10 lines 28-30 state "A common way for acquiring a real dimension unit in the image is to add an object of a known length to be imaged with the imaged subject."" (Page 12, the last paragraph, through page 13, paragraph 1, Response)

(5) "Krause performs the comparison between the models during the process of the surgery in order to obtain feedback. Paragraph 5 line 11 in Krause states "The actual geometry is compared with the 3D pre-surgical bone model to give feedback to the robot or surgeon while performing the surgery." The present application, by contrast performs the comparison between the models prior to the surgery for the purposes of calibrating the image by the pre operative planning system as explained in figure 1." (Page 13, paragraph 2, Response)

(6) "The currently amended claims are believed to be patentable over Krause. Claims 1-16 and 18-22 are depend from claim 1, and hence the present amendment is believed also to overcome the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-22. Claims 24-39 and 41-49 are depend from

Art Unit: 2128

claim 23, and hence the present amendment is believed also to overcome the rejection of claims 24-39 and 41-49.” (Page 13, paragraph 3, Response)

### ***Response to Arguments***

**8.** Applicants’ arguments have been fully considered.

**8-1.** Applicants’ argument (1) is persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-16, 18-22, 46, 47, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in Office Action dated July 8, 2009, have been withdrawn.

**8-2.** Applicants’ argument (2) is persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-16, 18-22, 46, 47, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 101 in Office Action dated July 8, 2009, have been withdrawn.

**8-3.** Applicants’ arguments (3), (4), and (6) are not persuasive. In response to Applicants’ arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In other words, Applicants’ arguments that Krause et al. fail to disclose using a real dimension unit for calibration are not persuasive because Kenet et al. have expressly disclosed the missing element and procedure. Specifically, Kenet et al. disclose at column 10, lines 40-51, “Once an image has been captured, calibration 314 of the image is performed to calibrate for absolute distances and to correct for spatial, color, or intensity distortions due to the acquisition equipment and circumstances. ... For example, an image of a ruler or grid may be obtained during a calibration session, or *simultaneously with the image of the surface structure* of interest.” In other words, as suggested by Kenet et al., associated with an image of a ruler in it (a real dimension unit in the image) the image of interest becomes a

Art Unit: 2128

calibrated image, which is exactly the same way as disclosed in the specification in page 10, lines 28-30, "A common way for acquiring a real dimension unit in the image is to add an object of a known length to be imaged with the imaged subject." Therefore, Applicants' arguments that Krause et al. fail to disclose using a real dimension unit for calibration are not persuasive.

**8-4.** Applicants' argument (5) is not persuasive. Krause et al. disclose at column 9, line 14, through column 10, line 17, "The planning computer then preferably "virtually" cuts the bone model 121 at each of these 20 slice locations 120 and moves the upper section of the bone until the midpoint of the upper end of the bone is aligned with the desired mechanical axis 126 (FIGS. 5B-5C). ... The planning computer preferably calculates this deviation distance for each of the 20 (or any number) of slice 120 iterations and determines which osteotomy location has the smallest deviation (all deviations shown as 130)." In other words, Krause et al. disclose that a calibration needs inherently be done before the planning computer may perform the alignment and calculation. Furthermore, Krause et al. disclose at column 11, lines 36-38, "Once the patient's bone has been properly modeled and/or a preliminary surgical plan has been developed, the patient is ready to undergo the actual orthopedic surgical procedure." In other words, Krause et al. disclose that a preliminary surgical plan with calibration should have been developed prior to the patient's actual orthopedic surgical procedure. Therefore, Applicants' argument is not persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

**9.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Herng-der Day whose telephone number is (571) 272-3777. The Examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 17:30.

Art Unit: 2128

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kamini S. Shah can be reached on (571) 272-2279. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kamini S Shah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128

/Herng-der Day/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2128

January 26, 2010